REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1, 5, 10, and 14 have been amended to correct typographical errors and/or informalities. Amendments to the claims are not intended to limit the scope of the invention or overcome any cited prior art. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-4

Claims 1 and 3-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,668,376 (hereinafter "Wang").

Claim 1, as amended, recites "providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel." The Office action states:

> Wang et al teach . . . providing information [URL database 13 in fig. 2, col. 3, line 61-col. 4, line 4] about the capabilities of the connector card to a memory within the connector card . . . .

(August 10, 2005 Office action, pg. 2).

Wang, however, does not disclose "providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 1. The URL database in Wang merely "correlates peripheral device identification data received from the peripheral device 2 to specific URL addresses in any known manner." (Col. 3, ll. 63-66). There is no discussion in Wang of the URL database "providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Wang fails to disclose, and the Office action fails to cite any passage of Wang as disclosing, "a memory within the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, based at least on the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that

claim 1 is not anticipated by Wang. Given that claims 3-4 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are not anticipated by Wang for at least the same reasons.

Claims 1 and 3-4 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Neill, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0182414 (hereinafter "O'Neill").

Claim 1, as amended, recites "providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel." The Office action states:

> O'Neill teaches . . . providing information [server manifest in paragraph 0057] about the capabilities of the connector card to a memory [onboard memory in paragraph 0063] within the connector card . . . .

(August 10, 2005 Office action, pg. 4).

O'Neill, however, is directed to "a software system and method for updating information which reduces the size of an update and distributes the update in a platform independent manner." (Pg. 1, para. 0002). It does not disclose "[a] method for automatically determining a configuration of an I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 1.

In addition, the server manifest merely "contains version information describing available update packages. . . . [and] update package characteristics such as file size so that the client can determine if enough space is available in the client storage area to receive and unpack the update package." (Pg. 6, para. 0057). There is no discussion in O'Neill of the server manifest "providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the onboard memory cited in O'Neill is part of "the update server." (Pg. 7, para. 0063). As such, the onboard memory in O'Neill cannot be characterized as "a memory within the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, based at least on the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by O'Neill. Given that claims 3-4 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are not anticipated by O'Neill for at least the same reasons.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Shinohara et al., Japanese Patent Publication No. 2001-117835 (hereinafter "Shinohara").

Shinohara, however, does not cure the deficiencies of Wang. Shinohara is directed to a "Printer, Information System, and Control Information Installing Method." (Title). It does not disclose, and the Office action does not cite any passage of Shinohara as disclosing, "providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if Shinohara was combined with Wang, the combination would neither teach nor suggest "providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, based at least on the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Wang in view of Shinohara. Given that claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are patentable over Wang in view of Shinohara for at least the same reasons.

Claim 2 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill in view of what is well known in the art.

The Office action, however, fails to cite anything well known in the art as disclosing "providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O

connector panel," as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if O'Neill was combined with what is well known in the art, the combination would neither teach nor suggest "providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, based at least on the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over O'Neill in view of what is well known in the art. Given that claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are patentable over O'Neill in view of what is well known in the art for at least the same reasons.

Claims 5-13

Claims 5, 7-10, and 12-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang.

Claims 5 and 10, as amended, recite an "I/O connector panel comprising . . . a memory containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel." The Office action states:

> Wang et al teach an I/O connector panel comprising . . . a memory containing information [URL database 13 in fig. 2, col. 3, line 61-col. 4, line 4] about the capabilities of the connector panel . . . .

(August 10, 2005 Office action, pg. 3).

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the URL database in Wang merely "correlates peripheral device identification data received from the peripheral device 2 to specific URL addresses in any known manner." (Col. 3, ll. 63-66). Wang does not disclose the URL database as "containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claims 5 and 10. Additionally, Wang fails to disclose, and the Office action fails to cite any passage of Wang as disclosing, an "I/O connector panel comprising . . . a memory," as recited in claims 5 and

10.

Accordingly, based at least on the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 10 are not anticipated by Wang. Given that claims 7-9 and 12-13 depend from claims 5 and 10, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are not anticipated by Wang for at least the same reasons.

Claims 5, 7-10, and 12-13 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Neill.

Claims 5 and 10, as amended, recite an "I/O connector panel comprising . . . a memory containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel." The Office action states:

> O'Neill teaches an I/O connector panel comprising . . . a memory containing information [server manifest in paragraph 0057] about the capabilities of the connector panel . . . .

(August 10, 2005 Office action, pg. 4).

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the server manifest in O'Neill merely "contains version information describing available update packages. . . . [and] update package characteristics such as file size so that the client can determine if enough space is available in the client storage area to receive and unpack the update package." (Pg. 6, para. 0057). O'Neill does not disclose the server manifest as "containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claims 5 and 10.

Furthermore, the onboard memory cited in O'Neill is part of "the update server." (Pg. 7, para. 0063). As such, O'Neill also fails to disclose an "I/O connector panel comprising . . . a memory," as recited in claims 5 and 10.

Accordingly, based at least on the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 10 are not anticipated by O'Neill. Given that claims 7-9 and 12-13 depend from claims 5 and 10, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are not anticipated by O'Neill for at least the same reasons.

Claims 6 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Shinohara.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Shinohara fails to cure the deficiencies of Wang. Shinohara is directed to a "Printer, Information System, and Control Information Installing Method." (Title). It does not disclose, and the Office action does not cite any passage of Shinohara as disclosing, an "I/O connector panel comprising . . . a memory containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claims 5 and 10. Thus, even if Shinohara was combined with Wang, the combination would neither teach nor suggest an "I/O connector panel comprising . . . a memory containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claims 5 and 10.

Accordingly, based at least on the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 10 are patentable over Wang in view of Shinohara. Given that claims 6-9 and 11-13 depend from claims 5 and 10, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are patentable over Wang in view of Shinohara for at least the same reasons.

Claims 6 and 11 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill in view of what is well known in the art.

The Office action, however, fails to cite anything well known in the art as disclosing an "I/O connector panel comprising . . . a memory containing information about the capabilities of the

I/O connector panel," as recited in claims 5 and 10. Thus, even if O'Neill was combined with what is well known in the art, the combination would neither teach nor suggest an "I/O connector panel comprising . . . a memory containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claims 5 and 10.

Accordingly, based at least on the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 10 are patentable over O'Neill in view of what is well known in the art. Given that claims 6-9 and 11-13 depend from claims 5 and 10, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are patentable over O'Neill in view of what is well known in the art for at least the same reasons.

Claims 14-15

Claims 14-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Shinohara.

Claim 14, as amended, recites "a plurality of I/O connector panels . . . each . . . comprising . . . an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel." The Office action states:

> Wang et al teach . . . a plurality of I/O connector panels coupled to the core PC function, each of the plurality of connector panels comprising . . . a memory containing information [URL database 13 in fig. 2, col. 3, line 61-col. 4, line 4] about the capabilities of the connector panel . . . .

(August 10, 2005 Office action, pg. 6).

As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 5 and 10, the URL database in Wang merely "correlates peripheral device identification data received from the peripheral device 2 to specific URL addresses in any known manner." (Col. 3, ll. 63-66). Wang does not disclose the URL

database as "containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 14. Additionally, Wang fails to disclose, and the Office action fails to cite any passage of Wang as disclosing, "a plurality of I/O connector panels . . . each . . . comprising . . . an EEROM," as recited in claim 14.

Moreover, as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 5, and 10, Shinohara does not cure the deficiencies of Wang. Shinohara is directed to a "Printer, Information System, and Control Information Installing Method." (Title). It does not disclose, and the Office action does not cite any passage of Shinohara as disclosing, "a plurality of I/O connector panels . . . each . . . comprising . . . an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 14. Thus, even if Shinohara was combined with Wang, the combination would neither teach nor suggest "a plurality of I/O connector panels . . . each . . . comprising . . . an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 14.

Accordingly, based at least on the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is patentable over Wang in view of Shinohara. Given that claim 15 depends from claim 14, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is patentable over Wang in view of Shinohara for at least the same reasons.

Claims 14-15 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill in view of what is well known in the art.

Claim 14, as amended, recites "a plurality of I/O connector panels . . . each . . . comprising . . . an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel." The Office action states:

> O'Neill teaches . . . a plurality of I/O connector panels coupled to the core PC function, each of the plurality of connector panels comprising . . . a memory containing information [server manifest in paragraph 0057] about the capabilities of the connector panel . . . .

(August 10, 2005 Office action, pg. 7).

As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 5, and 10, the server manifest in O'Neill merely "contains version information describing available update packages. . . . [and] update package characteristics such as file size so that the client can determine if enough space is available in the client storage area to receive and unpack the update package." (Pg. 6, para. 0057). O'Neill does not disclose the server manifest as "containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 14.

In addition, the onboard memory cited in O'Neill is part of "the update server." (Pg. 7, para. 0063). As such, O'Neill also fails to disclose "a plurality of I/O connector panels . . . each . . . comprising . . . an EEROM," as recited in claim 14.

Moreover, the Office action does not cite anything well known in the art as disclosing "a plurality of I/O connector panels . . . each . . . comprising . . . an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 14. Thus, even if O'Neill was combined with what is well known in the art, the combination would neither teach nor suggest "a plurality of I/O connector panels . . . each . . . comprising . . . an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel," as recited in claim 14.

Accordingly, based at least on the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is patentable over O'Neill in view of what is well known in the art. Given that claim 15 depends from claim 14, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is patentable over O'Neill in view of what is well known in the art for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: September 29, 2005

Erin C. Ming
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 47,797
(650) 475-1449